

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-16, and 21-31 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-16, and 21-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,865,719 B1 to Nicholas, III (herein "Nicholas"). That rejection is traversed by the present response as discussed next.

Initially, applicants note the outstanding Office Action is an incomplete Office Action that has not considered all the pending claims.

In the previously filed Amendment dependent claims 27-31 were added for examination and those claims have not been addressed in any way in the Office Action, and were also not even noted as pending in the Office Action. Each of those claims 27-31 recite similar limitations. Dependent claim 27 recites:

wherein when the determination part determines that the prescribed condition is not satisfied for the current display section, then the display data creating apparatus creates the display data so that the current display section is minimized.

The other dependent claims 28-31 recite the same or similar limitations. As noted above the outstanding Office Action has not even addressed such features, and applicants respectfully submit the features recited in those dependent claims 27-31 clearly defines over Nicholas. Nicholas does not disclose or suggest an operation of minimizing a current display if the predetermined condition, that predetermined condition being whether information contained in the current display section has been updated, is not satisfied. That is, according to dependent claims 27-31, when a current display section does not have any information therein that has been updated, that current display section is minimized. Nicholas does not disclose or suggest any such features, and thereby dependent claims 26-31 clearly distinguish over Nicholas.

As dependent claims 27-31 have not even been addressed in the Office Action, applicants respectfully submit the Finality of the outstanding Office Action must be withdrawn as the Office Action has not fully considered all the claims, the present response entered, and any subsequent communication clearly indicate the status of those claims 27-31.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 9-16, and 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Nicholas, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Each of the independent claims is herein amended to clarify the automatic changing and expanding a *size* of a current display section if the contents therein have been updated. Such features are believed to clearly distinguish over Nicholas.

According to the claims as currently written, in a display a currently displayed section can be automatically changed to be expanded in size when information therein has been updated. Such an operation can thereby attract a user's visual attention as a user will see an automatically enlarged display section, and the user will thus immediately know that the information in that enlarged display section has been updated. Nicholas does not disclose or suggest any such features. In contrast to such claim features, Nicholas discloses an alert message will appear on a display if certain monitored information has reached a certain level, and after that in Nicholas a user must manipulate a display screen to open the desired screen when that message appears on the screen. Nicholas does not automatically expand in size the display section when information in that display section has been updated.

One basis for maintaining the outstanding rejection cites Nicholas at column 15, line 55 to column 6, line 15 to disclose displaying a notification to a user when a prescribed condition occurs, such as when a stock reaches a current price.¹ In reply to that grounds for rejection applicants note that disclosure in Nicholas discloses providing a new alert message on a display when for example the noted stock price reaches a current price. Nicholas does

¹ Office Action of September 19, 2008, page 10, middle paragraph of the "Response to Arguments" section.

not disclose or suggest any *automatic enlarging of the size of a display section that has had information therein updated*.

The outstanding Office Action also notes that Nicholas discloses a message section can be expanded or enlarged when relevant to a user, citing Nicholas at column 2, lines 38-54 and especially lines 53-54.

In reply to that further grounds for the rejection applicants note Nicholas discloses the user must take an action to enlarge the display section that has had its information updated. The user must be prompted to take such an action based on the separately presented alert message. Those specific citations in Nicholas at column 2, lines 38-54 and especially lines 53-54, disclose different ways of displaying messages, and Nicholas specifically states “[i]n response to a user *command and movement of the icon*, the message moves as the icon moves, staying in relation to of adjacent to it so that the message stays within the user’s focus of attention” (Nicholas at column 2, lines 57-60, emphasis added).

Thereby, that disclosure in Nicholas again requires a user of the device of Nicholas to manipulate a display screen to enlarge a display section. As noted above, in Nicholas the user is prompted to initiate the command based on a new message being displayed.


Nicholas does not disclose or suggest automatically expanding a size of a current display section when information in that current display section has been updated, as recited in the claims as currently written.

In such ways applicants respectfully submit each of the claims as currently written positively recites features neither taught nor suggested by Nicholas, and thus the claims as currently written are allowable over Nicholas.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTYSNS\24'S\244421\244421US-AM5.DOC